

REMARKS

As of the 9 March 2009 *Office Action*, Claims 15-28 are pending in the Application. In the *Office Action*, the Examiner rejects all pending claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner with appreciation for the careful consideration and examination given to the Application. By this *Response*, Applicant amends certain claims to clarify some of the currently claimed embodiments. No new matter is believed introduced in this submission as at least ¶¶ [0029]-[0030], [0039], [0041], [0052], and [0059] of the *Specification* fully support the clarifying amendments.

Applicant submits this *Response* solely to facilitate prosecution. As such, Applicants reserve the right to present new or additional claims in this Application that have similar or broader scope as originally filed. Applicant also reserves the right to present additional claims in a later-filed continuation application that have similar or broader scope as originally filed. Accordingly, any amendment, argument, or claim cancellation is not to be construed as abandonment or disclaimer of subject matter.

After entry of this *Response*, Claims 15-32 are pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully asserts that the pending claims are in condition for allowance over the references of record, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in light of this submission. Applicant, accordingly, believes that the Application is allowable for the following reasons.

I. Overview of the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 15-22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,124,806 to Cunningham et al. (“Cunningham”) in view of Elizabeth M. Royer, “A Review of Current Routing Protocols for Ad Hoc Mobile Wireless Networks,” IEEE Personal Communications, April 1999 (“Royer”), U.S. Patent No. 5,251,205 to Callon et al. (“Callon”), and U.S. Patent No. 5,742,820 (“Perlman”). Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cunningham, Royer, and Callon in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,673,252 to Johnson (“Johnson”). Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cunningham, Royer, and Callon in further view of prior art allegedly admitted by Applicant. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cunningham, Royer, Callon, and Johnson in further view of Jil A. Westcott, “Issues in Distributed Routing for Mobile Packet Radio Networks”, IEEE, 1982 (“Jil”).

a. Claims 15-22 Are Patentable Over The Cited References

Claim 15, recites features not disclosed in the cited references. In particular, Claim 15 recites storing on the site controller look-up tables for identifying a communication device in the second communication network and a function to be performed by the site controller. Applicant submits that at least this feature is not disclosed in the cited references.

The cited references fail to disclose a first and second look-up table as recited in Claim 15. Claim 15 recites storing on the site controller a first look-up table for identifying each of the plurality of communication devices that define a second communication network. Claim 15 further recites storing on the site controller a second look-up table for identifying a function to be performed by the site controller based upon an analysis of a message received from any one of the plurality of communication devices that define a second communication network. The cited references do not disclose storing a first and second look-up table, as recited in Claim 15, on a site controller.

For at least these reasons, the cited references fail to disclose each and every feature recited in Claim 15. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 15 is patentable over the cited references, and is in condition for allowance. Further, Claims 16-22 are believed to be allowable due to their ultimate dependence on Claim 15, and further features recited therein.

b. Claims 23-27 and 32 Are Patentable Over The Cited References

Claim 23, as amended, recites features not disclosed in the cited references. In particular, Claim 23 recites means for translating a communication message between a first communication protocol and a second communication protocol. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to disclose the claimed means for translating a message from a first to a second communication protocol. Therefore, the cited references fail to disclose each and every feature recited in Claim 23.

Regarding Claim 32, the cited references fail to disclose the claimed database. Claim 32 recites a means for maintaining a database containing information relating to the second communication network including the function of the first and second communication devices, the unique address of the first and second communication devices, and current data contained in a response message. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to disclose this feature.

For at least these reasons, the cited references fail to disclose each and every feature recited in Claim 23. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 23 is patentable over the cited references, and is in condition for allowance. Further, Claims 24-27 and 32 are believed to be allowable due to their ultimate dependence on Claim 23, and further features recited therein.

c. Claim 28-31 Are Patentable Over The Cited References

Claims 28 and 29 recites features not disclosed in the cited references. In particular, Claim 28 recites a site controller translating a message from a host computer to a communication device in a second communication network from a second communication protocol into the first communication protocol. Claim 29 recites a site controller translating a message from a communication device in a second communication network to a host computer from a first communication protocol into a second communication protocol. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose a method of controlling communication employing a site controller that can translate a message between a first communication protocol to a second communication protocol.

Additionally, the cited references fail to disclose a method of controlling communication employing the recited packet structure. In particular, Claim 30 recites that a message from any one of the communication devices that define a second communication network to the host computer contains a preface and a postscript. Claim 28 recites that the first communication protocol is an open data packet protocol. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not disclosed in the cited references.

For at least these reasons, the cited references fail to disclose each and every feature recited in Claim 28. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 28 is patentable over the cited references, and is in condition for allowance. Further, Claims 29-31 are believed to be allowable due to their ultimate dependence on Claim 28, and further features recited therein.

II. Fees

This *Response* is filed within three months of the *Office Action* dated 9 March 2009, thus no extension of time fees are believed due. This *Response* does not introduce additional claims beyond those paid for upon filing, thus no claim fees are believed due. Applicant expressly authorizes the Commissioner to charge deposit account No. 20-1507 for payment of any fees necessary for full acceptance of this *Response*.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that after entry of this *Response* the Application is fully in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should any other issues remain prior to the allowance of this Application. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to: Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop RCE, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 via the USPTO's EFS-Web Electronic Filing System on **28 May 2009**.

/Filip A. Kowalewski 60,026/
Filip A. Kowalewski, USPTO Reg. No. 60,026

TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP
Bank of America Plaza
600 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 5200
Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216
United States
Phone: 404.885.3487
Fax: 404.962.6654
DATE: 28 May 2009

Respectfully submitted,

TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP

/Filip A. Kowalewski 60,026/
Filip A. Kowalewski
USPTO Reg. No. 60,026